

Strange Stars with Realistic Quark Vector Interaction and Phenomenological Density-dependent Scalar Potential

Mira Dey^{1,2,†}, Ignazio Bombaci³, Jishnu Dey^{4,†},
Subharthi Ray^{1,4,†} and B. C. Samanta⁵

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We derive an equation of state (EOS) for strange matter, starting from an interquark potential which *(i)* has asymptotic freedom built into it, *(ii)* shows confinement at zero density ($\rho_B = 0$) and deconfinement at high ρ_B , and *(iii)* gives a stable configuration for chargeless, β -stable quark matter. This EOS is then used to calculate the structure of Strange Stars, and in particular their mass-radius relation. Our present results confirm and reinforce the recent claim[1, 2] that the compact objects associated with the x-ray pulsar Her X-1, and with the x-ray burster 4U 1820-30 are strange stars.

Keywords: Strange Quark Matter, compact objects, x-ray bursts.

¹⁾Dept. of Physics, Presidency College, Calcutta 700 073, India. ²⁾An associate member of the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy. ³⁾Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa and I.N.F.N. Sezione di Pisa, via Buonarroti 2, I-56100 Pisa, Italy. ⁴⁾Azad Physics Centre, Dept. of Physics, Maulana Azad College, Calcutta 700 013, India. ⁵⁾Department of Physics, Burdwan University, Burdwan 713104, India. [†] Work supported in part by DST grant no. SP/S2/K18/96, Govt. of India, permanent address: 1/10 Prince Golam Md. Road, Calcutta 700 026, India.

Strange stars (SS) are astrophysical compact objects which are entirely made of deconfined u, d, s quark matter (*strange matter*). The possible existence of SS is a direct consequence of the conjecture [3, 4] that strange matter (SM) may be the absolute ground state of strongly interacting matter rather than ^{56}Fe . Since this hypothesis was formulated, strange stars have been studied by many authors [5, 6, 7, 8], but they remained purely theoretical entities. This situation changed in the last few years, thanks to the large amount of fresh observational data collected by the new generation of x-ray and γ -ray satellites. In fact, recent studies [1, 2] have shown that the compact objects associated with the x-ray pulsar Her X-1, and with the x-ray burster 4U 1820-30, are good strange star candidates.

Most of the previous calculations of SS properties used an equation of state (EOS) for strange matter based on the MIT bag model. In this phenomenological model the basic features of QCD (*i.e.* quark confinement and asymptotic freedom) are built in. The deconfinement of quarks at high density is not obvious in the model. Some people have also expressed more general reservations about the bag model and, in particular, about the use of a large value for the bag constant [9]. In fact, to get SS configurations with a mass-radius (MR) relation in agreement with the semiempirical MR relations [1, 10] for the two SS candidates mentioned above, one must indeed use large values of the bag constant $B \simeq 110 \text{ MeV}/\text{fm}^3$ (which in different units correspond to $\bar{B} \equiv (\hbar c)^3 B \simeq (170.5 \text{ MeV})^4$, which is still small compared with the estimate from QCD sum rules [9, 11]. But this value is large when compared with the “standard value” $B = 56 \text{ MeV}/\text{fm}^3$ ($(144 \text{ MeV})^4$) which is able to reproduce the mass spectrum of light hadrons and heavy mesons [12]. Large values of B are also not allowed by the requirement SM is stable in bulk [13, 14]: *e.g.* for $m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}$ the permitted values of the bag constant are in the range $(56 - 78) \text{ MeV}/\text{fm}^3$ (see Fig.1 of ref.[13]). However, in general, B has been considered as an effective parameter, and the bag model should be only regarded as a simple model with limited connection to QCD.¹ We will thus use the bag model, but only to compare our

¹The point is that QCD sum rules [11] lead to a bag constant, which is substantially larger than the value fitted in the simple bag model. This theme is stressed, *e.g.*, in ref.[9] pag. 367: “There do exist a number of modified bag models with a smaller bag radius and correspondingly larger B values . . . and the authors claim that the sum rule values would

results with it qualitatively.

If the compact objects in Her X-1 and 4U 1820-30 are really strange stars, then there will be very deep consequences for both the physics of strong interactions and astrophysics. The existence of stable nugget of SM would have also profound implications in cosmology, in relation to the dark matter problem, in the sense that many such stars, unlike the two mentioned above, may as yet be unobserved. Note however, that by strange stars now we mean conglomeration of chargeless beta-stable (u, d, s) quarks held together strongly by gravity, with a surface density about five times that of nuclear matter and an interior density which may be 3 times higher. Witten's original conjecture is still applicable for such conglomerates, - that they may remain as relics of the cooling of the universe a millionth of a second after its formation [4]. This is largely because chargeless beta-stable (u, d, s) quarks have a minimum in its EOS at about five times that of nuclear matter and can thus form the surface of a SS.

Motivated by the fundamental importance of this issue, and by the criticism to the bag model mentioned above, in the present work we investigate the properties of SS, using an EOS for SM based on an alternative to the bag model.

Intuitively we know that at high density the quarks should go over from their constituent masses to their current masses, thus restoring the approximate chiral symmetry of QCD. On the other hand, the interquark interaction should be screened in the medium. The latter will give rise to deconfinement at high density. To this end we use the following Hamiltonian: ²

$$H = \sum_i \left(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_i + \beta_i M_i \right) + \sum_{i < j} \frac{\lambda(i)\lambda(j)}{4} V_{ij} \quad (1)$$

where we have two potentials: a scalar and a vector. The scalar originates from the mass term. The quark mass, M_i , is taken to be density dependent

support their model. Such claims are, however, not very sensible. In each of these models additional interactions are introduced. The energy and pressure associated with these additional interactions and that due to the QCD vacuum state are interwoven, such that it is not clear which quantity should be compared with the trace of the energy momentum tensor."

²In the following we use units where $\hbar = c = 1$

and of the form:

$$M_i = m_i + (310 \text{ MeV}) \text{sech}(\nu \frac{\rho_B}{\rho_0}), \quad i = u, d, s. \quad (2)$$

where $\rho_B = (\rho_u + \rho_d + \rho_s)/3$ is the baryon number density, $\rho_0 = 0.17 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ is the normal nuclear matter density, and ν is a parameter.

At high ρ_B the quark mass M_i falls from its constituent value to its current one which we take to be [11]: $m_u = 4 \text{ MeV}$, $m_d = 7 \text{ MeV}$, $m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}$. The density dependence introduces a density dependent scalar potential and more importantly restores chiral symmetry smoothly at high density (Fig.1).

It is hard to justify the density dependent mass term except qualitatively. It appears we are the first to suggest such a form. On the other hand at finite T the restoration of chiral symmetry can be established from lattice calculations (see for example [15]). However, from calculations of meson [16] or baryon properties [17, 18], it is clear that inside a hadron the quark mass varies with the radius even as the density varies with the radius. For example in [16], the minimum quark masses are, $m_u = 186 \text{ MeV}$ and $m_s = 364 \text{ MeV}$ whereas the averaged effective quark masses are $m_u = 305 \text{ MeV}$ and $m_s = 465 \text{ MeV}$. It will become clear that in our calculation we are not dealing with small variations in the quark density as in a bound-state hadron calculation, and thus this density dependence of the scalar potential is all the more crucial for us.

The colour dependent vector potential in eq.(1) is an interquark potential originating from gluon exchanges, and the λ -s are the color SU(3) matrices for the two interacting quarks. In the absence of an accurate evaluation of the potential (e.g. from large N_c planar diagrams) we borrow it from meson phenomenology, namely the Richardson potential [19]. It incorporates the two concepts of asymptotic freedom and linear quark confinement. The potential reproduces heavy meson spectra and has been used in sophisticated calculations involving two-body-Dirac equation derived from Dirac constraint mechanism for light as well as heavy mesons [16]. It has been well tested for baryons in Fock calculations [17, 18]. The potential used for the meson and baryon is [19]

$$V_{ij} = \frac{12\pi}{27} \frac{1}{\ln(1 + (\mathbf{k}_i - \mathbf{k}_j)^2/\Lambda^2)} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{k}_i - \mathbf{k}_j)^2}, \quad (3)$$

with the scale parameter [11] $\Lambda = 100 \text{ MeV}$. This bare potential in a medium will be screened due to pair creation and infrared divergence. The inverse

screening length, D^{-1} , to the lowest order is [20]:

$$(D^{-1})^2 \equiv \frac{2\alpha_0}{\pi} \sum_{i=u,d,s} k_i^f \sqrt{(k_i^f)^2 + m_i^2} \quad (4)$$

where k_i^f , the Fermi momentum of the i -th quark is obtained from the corresponding number density:

$$k_i^f = (\rho_i \pi^2)^{1/3} \quad (5)$$

and α_0 is the perturbative quark gluon coupling. To simplify numerical calculations, instead of summing over all the individual flavours, we have averaged over the flavours so that

$$(D^{-1})^2 \simeq \frac{3 \times 2\alpha_0}{\pi} k_{av}^f \sqrt{(k_{av}^f)^2 + m_{av}^2} \quad (6)$$

where

$$k_{av}^f = (\pi^2 \rho_B)^{1/3} = \left(\frac{(k_u^f)^3 + (k_d^f)^3 + (k_s^f)^3}{3} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (7)$$

$$m_{av} = \frac{m_u + m_d + m_s}{3}. \quad (8)$$

The model we adopt has the following attractive features: It truly describes deconfined quarks at finite density, through the Debye screening (DS, in short). At zero density (for an isolated hadron)

D^{-1} vanishes, leading to confinement. At finite density, due to DS, the gluon polarization acquires a non-zero value leading to deconfinement. The scalar potential also decreases with density, thus restoring chiral symmetry at high density. The resulting inverse DS is also plotted in Fig.1.

Within the present approach, the energy density of SM can be written

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_v \quad (9)$$

where the kinetic part is given by

$$\varepsilon_k = \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \sum_{i=u,d,s} \left[k_i^f \left((k_i^f)^2 + M_i^2/2 \right) \sqrt{(k_i^f)^2 + M_i^2} - \frac{M_i^4}{2} \ln \frac{\sqrt{((k_i^f)^2 + M_i^2)} + k_i^f}{M_i} \right] \quad (10)$$

and the potential contribution is given by

$$\varepsilon_v = -\frac{1}{2\pi^3} \sum_{i,j} \int_{-1}^{+1} dx \int_0^{k_j^f} k_j^2 \int_0^{k_i^f} k_i^2 f(k_i, k_j, M_i, M_j, x) V[D^{-1}, (\mathbf{k}_i - \mathbf{k}_j)^2] dk_j dk_i \quad (11)$$

where V is the screened Richardson potential. In other words, $(\mathbf{k}_i - \mathbf{k}_j)^2$ in eqn. (3) is replaced by $[(\mathbf{k}_i - \mathbf{k}_j)^2 + D^{-2}]$ and

$$f(k_i, k_j, M_i, M_j, x) = (e_i \cdot e_j + 2 \cdot k_i \cdot k_j \cdot x + \frac{k_i^2 \cdot k_j^2}{e_i \cdot e_j}) \frac{1}{(e_i - M_i)(e_j - M_j)} \quad (12)$$

with

$$e_i = \sqrt{k_i^2 + M_i^2} + M_i \quad (13)$$

Then we calculate the self consistent chemical potentials to satisfy the β -equilibrium and charge neutrality conditions,

$$\mu_d = \mu_s, \quad \mu_d = \mu_u + \mu_e ; \quad (14)$$

$$2(k_u^f)^3 - (k_s^f)^3 - (k_d^f)^3 - (k_e^f)^3 = 0 \quad (15)$$

where μ -s are the chemical potentials of u, d, s quarks and the electron, e . We assume that the neutrinos have left the system ($\mu_\nu = 0$).

If m_e is the electron mass, k_e^f is obtained through

$$k_e^f = \sqrt{\mu_e^2 - m_e^2}. \quad (16)$$

To achieve the conditions (14,15), we have the additional difficulties originating from the density dependence of the quark masses and DS length.

The chemical potential for the i -th quark is given by :

$$\mu_i = \sqrt{M_i^2 + (k_i^f)^2} + (\Delta\mu_i)_M + (\Delta\mu_i)_V, \quad i = u, d, s. \quad (17)$$

where $(\Delta\mu_i)_M$ is the contribution from ε_k (eq.10), which is evaluated straightforwardly:

$$(\Delta\mu_i)_M \equiv \frac{\partial \varepsilon_k}{\partial M_i} \frac{\partial M_i}{\partial \rho_i} = (\rho_s^u + \rho_s^d + \rho_s^s) \frac{\partial M_i}{\partial \rho_i} \quad (18)$$

ρ_s^i being the scalar density for the i -th quark

$$\rho_s^i = \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \left[2M_i k_i^f \sqrt{(k_i^f)^2 + M_i^2} - 2M_i^3 \ln \frac{\sqrt{(k_i^f)^2 + M_i^2} + k_i^f}{M_i} \right] \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, the contribution from the potential part (11) of the energy density

$$(\Delta\mu_i)_V = \frac{\partial\varepsilon_v}{\partial k_i^f} \frac{\partial k_i^f}{\partial\rho_i} + \frac{\partial\varepsilon_v}{\partial M_i} \frac{\partial M_i}{\partial\rho_i} \quad (20)$$

is rather complicated and it is evaluated numerically. Equations (14,15) can now be satisfied and the EOS for β -stable SM is obtained.

With this EOS we solve the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkov equation to calculate the structure of non-rotating SS. The properties of the maximum mass configuration for different choices of our model parameters are summarized in Tab.1. Our EOS is most sensitive to the parameters ν and α_0 which rule the density dependence of the quark mass and DS length respectively. However, we found that a change within 20% of these parameters, *e.g.*, around the values $\nu = 0.33$, $\alpha_0 = 0.20$, produce a change of M_{max} and of the corresponding radius which is smaller than 10%. In the same table we also report, for comparison, the results we obtained using an EOS for SM based on the bag model with the following choice of the parameters: $B = 110 \text{ MeV}/fm^3$, $m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}$, and $B = 110 \text{ MeV}/fm^3$, $m_s = 0$, with the strong coupling constant $\alpha_c = 0$ (no gluons) in both cases. There have been other theoretical approaches to the study of SS [8, 21]. The work of Drago et al. [8] uses (u, d) quark masses close to 100 MeV in the colour dielectric model and gets a maximum mass $\sim 1.6 M/M_\odot$ and a radius of about 10 km. In [21] a very strong magnetic field is proposed as a mechanism for softening a bag equation of state.

The calculated mass-radius relations are plotted in Fig.2, and refer to our present model (curves labeled eos1 and eos2) and to the bag model for the EOS. There is qualitative agreement with the bag model results, and in particular for low values of the mass, M is proportional to R^3 . However, the two bag model calculations, close to our curves indeed use a large bag pressure *which remains constant at all densities*. In Fig.2, we also compare the theoretical MR relations with the semiempirical MR for the two strange star candidates. The closed region in Fig.2, labeled 4U 1820-30 represents the semiempirical MR relation recently extracted from observational data by Haberl and Titarchuk [10] and used in the theoretical analysis of ref.[2]. The trapezium-like region labeled Her X-1 represents the semiempirical MR relation for the compact object in Her X-1. We followed the analysis by Wasserman and Shapiro [22] updated with new mass and distance measures

of Her X-1 as reported in ref.[23, 24]. Dashed curves *a* and *b* in Fig.2 denote the MR relation for Her X-1, assuming an x-ray luminosity $L = 2.0 \cdot 10^{37}$ erg/s and $L = 5.0 \cdot 10^{37}$ erg/s respectively. The two values of the luminosity we used correspond to a distance of 5.0 kpc and 7.9 kpc respectively. To be aware of the sensitivity to the luminosity, we also report the MR relation (curve *c*) assuming the Eddington luminosity for spherical accretion as an upper bound. The two horizontal lines locate the measured mass of Her X-1 ($1.1 - 1.8$) $M_{\odot}$.

It is very important to stress that the above MR relations have been extracted from two different type of astronomical phenomena — x-ray burst spectra (4U 1820-30) and cyclotron line data from a x-ray pulsar in a binary system (Her X-1) — and using different theoretical models to analyze the original observational data. The two semiempirical MR relations overlap in a region of the MR plane indicating the existence of a compact object with a radius of 6–8 km. This shows that the analysis performed in ref. [2] in the case of the x-ray buster 4U 1820-30 also extends to the case of Her X-1. In particular, neutron star models based on “conventional” EOS of dense matter [2] are unable to reproduce the semiempirical MR relation for these two compact objects.

The MR relation calculated with our EOS for SM is well within both the semiempirical MR relations of the two SS candidates. In conclusion, our present results confirm and reinforce the recent claim[1, 2] that the compact objects associated with the x-ray pulsar Her X-1, and with the x-ray burster 4U 1820-30 are strange stars.

This paper was inspired by discussions of an early work done by two of us (JD and MD) with Prof. Jean Le Tourneux in 1984 ([17]). JD and MD acknowledge the hospitality of the International Centre of Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy where this work was initiated. MD is particularly grateful to Dr. M. Malheiro for the introduction of the subject through series of e-mails, specially, the units and the TOV equation. It is a pleasure to thank Drs. S. K. Samaddar, A. Ganguly, B. Datta and F. Weber, S.Raha and S. Ghosh for many discussions.

References

- [1] X.-D. Li, Z.-G Dai and Z.-R. Wang, *Astron. and Astrophys.* 303 (1995) L1.
- [2] I. Bombaci, *Phys. Rev. C* 55 (1997) 1587.
- [3] A.R. Bodmer, *Phys. Rev. D* 4, (1971) 160.
- [4] E. Witten, *Phys. Rev. D* 30(1984) 272.
- [5] G. Baym, S.A. Chin, *Phys.Lett.* 62B (1976) 241.
- [6] P. Haensel, J.L. Zdunik, R. Schaeffer, *Astron. and Astrophys.* 160 (1986) 121.
- [7] C. Alcock, E. Farhi, A. Olinto, *Astrophys.Jour.* 310 (1986) 261.
- [8] A. Drago, U. Tambini, M. Hjorth-Jensen, *Phys.Lett.* B380, (1996) 13.
- [9] W. Greiner and A. Schäfer, *Quantum Chromodynamics* (Springer Verlag, 1994)
- [10] F. Haberl and L. Titarchuk, *Astron. and Astrophys.* 299 (1995) 414.
- [11] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.* 147 (1974) 385.
- [12] T. De Grand et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 12 (1975) 2060; W.C. Haxton, L. Heller, *Phys.Rev. D* 22 (1980) 1198.
- [13] E. Farhi, R.L. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev. D* 30 (1984) 2379.
- [14] J. Madsen, *Astron. and Astrophys.* 318 (1997) 466.
- [15] C. Bernard et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78 (1997) 598.
- [16] H. W. Crater, and P. van Alstine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 53 (1984) 1527.
- [17] J. Dey, M. Dey, J. Le Tourneux, *Phys. Rev. D* 34 (1986) 2104.
- [18] J. Dey, M. Dey, G. Mukhopadhyaya and B. C. Samanta, *Can. J.Phys.* 69 (1991) 749; Jishnu Dey and Lauro Tomio, Mira Dey, T. Frederico, *Phys. Rev. C* 44 (1991) 2181; M. Dey and J. Dey, *Nuclear and Particle Physics, the Changing Interface*, (Springer Verlag, 1993).
- [19] J. L. Richardson, *Phys. Lett. B* 82 (1979) 272.
- [20] V. Baluni, *Phys. Rev. D* 17 (1978) 2092 ; J. Kapusta, *Phys. Rev. D* 20(1979) 989 ; T. Toimela, *Int. J. Theo. Phys.* 24 (1985) 901 ; E.V. Shuryak, *The QCD Vacuum, Hadrons and the Superdense Matter*, (World Scientific, 1988).

- [21] D. Bandyopadhyaya, S. Chakraborty and S. Pal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 2177.
- [22] I. Wasserman, S. Shapiro, Astrophys. Jour. 265 (1983) 1036.
- [23] A.P. Reynolds, H. Quaintrell, M.D. Still, P. Roche, D. Chakraborty, S.E. Levine, *MNRAS*, submitted, (1997).
- [24] M.H. van Kerkwijk, J. van Paradijs, E.J. Zuiderwijk, Astron. and Astrophys. 303(1995) 497.

Table 1: Properties of the maximum mass strange star configuration obtained for different equations of state: M_G is the gravitational (maximum) mass, R is the corresponding radius, ρ_c the central number density, ε_c the central mass density. Our EOS for different choices of the parameters are denoted as follow: (eos1) $\nu = 0.40$, $\alpha_0 = 0.20$; (eos2) $\nu = 1/3$, $\alpha_0 = 0.20$; (eos3) $\nu = 1/3$, $\alpha_0 = 0.15$. The the bag model EOS are denoted as follow: (B110;150) $B = 110 \text{ MeV}/fm^3$, $m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}$; (B110;0) $B = 110 \text{ MeV}/fm^3$, $m_s = 0$ ($\alpha_c = 0$ in both cases)

EOS	$M_G/M_\odot$	$R(\text{km})$	$\rho_c(fm^{-3})$	$\varepsilon_c(10^{14}g/cm^3)$
eos1	1.414	7.18	2.24	44.6
eos2	1.286	6.53	2.57	53.6
eos3	1.301	6.62	2.55	52.4
B110;150	1.358	7.50	1.87	42.0
B110;0	1.448	7.90	1.76	38.1

Fig. 1 The inverse Debye screening length D^{-1} for $\alpha_0 = 0.20$, and the d quark mass M_d , for $\nu = 0.4$ (dashed line) and $\nu = 1/3$ (continuous line), are plotted as a function of the baryon number density.

Fig. 2 The theoretical MR relations (curves eos1 and eos2) calculated within the present model are compared with the semiempirical MR relations for 4U 1820-30 and Her X-1 (closed regions in the MR plane labeled 4U 1820-30 and Her X-1, respectively). The remaining two continuous curves represent the MR relation calculated with the bag model EOS, with $m_s = 0$ (upper curve) and $m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}$ (lower curve), and $B = 110 \text{ MeV}/fm^3$ in both cases.



